

Planning Appeal Decisions

Committee: Western Area Planning Committee on 3rd February 2021

Officer: Bob Dray, Team Leader (Development Control)

Recommendation: Note contents of this report

1. This reports summaries recent appeal decisions in the table below, and provides feedback on some of the key findings. The appeal decisions and associated documents can be viewed by searching by the application reference number on the Council's Public Access website: <https://publicaccess.westberks.gov.uk/online-applications/>

Application / Appeal	Site	LPA Decision	Appeal Decision + any costs	Decision Date
20/00270/HOUSE Appeal: 3250095 Written Reps	60 Reading Road, Pangbourne Convert front garden into parking and dropped kerb	Delegated refusal	Dismissed	03/09/20
19/01511/FUL Appeal: 3242425 Hearing	Land north of Theobald Drive, Purley On Thames 7 detached dwellings with car parking, access and all associated landscaping and ancillary works.	Delegated refusal	Dismissed	21/10/20
18/02727/FULD Appeal: 3233002 Written Reps	Land east of Limeswell, High Street, Streatley Erection of a three bedroom house including studio, conservatory and garage	Delegated refusal	Dismissed	22/10/20
19/02750/CERTP Appeal: 3252766 Written Reps	4 The Maltings, West Ilsley Certificate of lawful use or development sought for installation of solar panels on roof.	Delegated refusal	Dismissed	26/10/20
19/02526/FUL Appeal: 3247250 Written Reps	9 Bloomfieldhatch Lane, Grazeley Two storey pitched roof extension to existing garage block and the conversion of the building to a new granny annexe.	Delegated refusal	Allowed	27/10-20
19/02265/FULD Appeal: 3252506 Written Reps	Land to the south of Maida's Way, Aldermaston Erection of four dwellings.	Delegated refusal	Dismissed	29/10/20
19/02947/FULD Appeal: 3255122 Written Reps	Maple Corner, Maple Lane, Upper Basildon Erection of a new four bed dwelling including new access, hardstanding and landscaping.	Recommended for approval EAPC refusal	Allowed	03/11/20

19/02333/FULD Appeal: 3249672 Written Reps	Three Cliffs, Bere Court Road, Pangbourne Retention of existing house, demolition of existing barn building and greenhouse. Division of plot to allow for the construction of a new family dwelling and double garage. New double garage outbuilding for the existing house and associated works to the driveway.	Recommended for approval EAPC refusal	Allowed	12/11/20
19/02144/FULD Appeal: 3250230 Written Reps	Inglewood Farm Cottage, Templeton Road, Kintbury Section 73 to vary condition 2 (approved plans) of 19/00277/FULD: replacement dwelling.	Recommended for refusal WAPC resolved to approve DPC refusal	Dismissed	16/11/20
19/02522/FUL Appeal: 3256941 Written Reps	Church View Barn, Back Lane, Stanford Dingley The demolition of the existing stable block and the construction of a three-bay replacement garage building with adjoining log store, alongside associated parking, access and landscaping works and the change of use of land to a residential use.	Recommended for approval EAPC refusal	Allowed	21/12/20
19/00832/REM Appeal: 3256565 Written Reps	Land adjacent to Summerfield, The Ridge, Cold Ash Reserved matters of outline 16/02529/OUTD (5 dwellings). Matters seeking consent: appearance, landscaping and scale.	Recommended for approval WAPC refusal	Allowed	05/01/21
18/01657/COND1 Appeal: 3257645 Written Reps	Land adjacent to Summerfield, The Ridge, Cold Ash Approval of details reserved by conditions on 16/02529/OUTD (5 dwellings).	Non-determination WAPC minded to refuse	Allowed	05/01/21

‘Other suitable land’ within settlement boundaries

2. According to Core Strategy Policy CS1, “*new homes will be primarily developed on (amongst others) suitable previously developed land within settlement boundaries, and other suitable land within settlement boundaries*” (emphasis added). The following decisions emphasise that there is not an ‘in principle’ policy support for new housing within settlement boundaries; whilst there is a presumption in favour of residential (re)development, a wider assessment is required to conclude whether such proposals are in accordance with the housing policies.
3. In **Theobald Drive**, taking into account the significant contribution to the landscape character of the green corridor along Oxford Road, and that it forms part of the area’s

green infrastructure, the Inspector concluded that the site is not 'other suitable land' within the settlement boundary where Policy CS1 directs new housing. The appeal was therefore dismissed.

4. Similarly, **Limeswell** is within the settlement boundary of Streatley. The appeal site fronted a developed part of the High Street in Streatley and forms part of the existing property's garden. The site lies within the Streatley Conservation Area and there are many listed buildings nearby. The local area also forms part of the North Wessex Downs AONB. It was proposed to erect a two storey house and form a new access to the highway. The site lies in the defined settlement boundary of Streatley, thus the Inspector recognised that the principle of the erection of a new dwelling is generally acceptable in planning policy terms subject to site specific aspects concerning the effect of the development proposed on the heritage assets of the Conservation Area; the setting of nearby listed buildings, and highway safety issues.

Housing in the countryside

5. In considering the four proposed houses at **Maida's Way**, on land outside of any settlement boundary, the Inspector states that no evidence has been put before him that the proposal would satisfy any of the exceptions identified in Policy C1, and having reviewed the scheme against these exceptions, the Inspector was satisfied that the proposal could not comply with the approach to housing in the countryside, and is therefore contrary to the development plan.
6. The Inspector went onto consider the arguments made by the appellant that the housing requirement of the Core Strategy should be regarded as a minimum figure and the Government objectives enshrined within the NPPF so significantly boost the supply of home ought to override the provisions of the Core Strategy. However, the Inspector noted that the Council can demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites, therefore he could see no good reason to set aside the development plan, or treat it as somehow out-of-date, in favour of the NPPF in this context. The Inspector also acknowledged the location of the site in relation to local services and facilities and the economic benefits arising from the development; however, the Inspector stated that in cases where the Council can demonstrate a five-year supply, that the planning system should be genuinely plan led.

Housing in relation to AWE

7. The appeal site for **Maida's Way** lies within the Detailed Emergency Planning Zone (DEPZ) surrounding the Aldermaston Atomic Weapons Establishment (AWE). The DEPZ is the geographic area within which West Berkshire Council is required to coordinate an Off-Site Emergency Plan (OSEP), along with other agencies. The proposed development would be located on the northern edge of the DEPZ, about 1100m from the site boundary of the AWE.
8. Core Strategy Policy CS8 relates specifically to proposals in proximity to AWE and states that in the interests of public safety, residential development in the inner land use planning consultation zones of AWE, is likely to be refused planning when the Office for Nuclear Regulation (ONR) has advised against that development. In this case, the proposed scheme is located within the inner land use zone of AWE Aldermaston. In consultation on the appeal application, AWE advised against the proposed scheme on the cumulative effects of additional dwellings within the DEPZ and that it would have an adverse effect on the AWE OSEP.

9. The Inspector recognised that the proposal would result in an increase in the population within the Sector. Whilst these additional numbers would be relatively small and the appeal site is located on the very edge of the DEPZ, next to a main road, the Inspector concluded that, despite the overall population within Sector R being less than other Sectors, due to this increase in population, the appeal proposal would be likely to prejudice the ability to implement the OSEP in the event of a radiation emergency. Accordingly, it would, as a result of its proximity to the Aldermaston AWE, increase the risk of harm to human health. He therefore concluded that the proposed development would result in an increase risk to human health, and in this respect, would be contrary to Policy CS8 of the Core Strategy and paragraph 95 of the NPPF.

Annexes

10. In **9 Bloomfieldhatch Lane** one of the main issues was whether the proposal would constitute the creation of a separate dwelling, and if so whether this would be a suitable location for housing having regard to the development strategy for the area and accessibility to services and facilities. The appeal site comprised a detached two storey dwelling situated in a large plot with sizeable rear garden. A detached double bay hipped roof car port is located within this garden, which is accessed via a driveway which is located approximately to the south of the site. The appeal proposal is for an extension to the existing car port in the rear garden. This would extend the south-west elevation to provide an L shaped annexe. The proposal is for a granny annexe including several bedrooms, a small kitchen, lounge space and a garage. The Council was concerned that the amount of accommodation space provided, alongside the facilities provided for day-to-day living, and the separation distance from the main dwelling meant the proposal was tantamount to the creation of a new dwelling in the countryside.
11. The Inspector disagreed. They commented that whilst the accommodation provided was generous within the annexe, the proposed lounge, kitchen and bathroom are more modest in size and are commensurate to the needs of a single occupier. The proposal is located approximately 20 metres from the main dwelling, however there are no physical boundaries between the two and the proposal does not include any separate outdoor space of its own. The annexe would share a joint access, driveway and parking area with the existing dwelling. Furthermore, the annexe would not have a separate address nor would it have a separate utility provision. This would, in the Inspector's view, indicate that the proposal would remain ancillary to the main dwelling and would not become a separate residential dwelling.
12. The Inspector noted that the Council's *House Extensions* Supplementary Planning Guidance 2004 (SPG) states that large granny annexes capable of being made into separate dwellings will not normally be acceptable. However, they commented that SPG is not specific on any space standards which would constitute a large annexe. They were satisfied that a planning condition could be imposed to restrict the use of the annexe to ancillary.

Streatley Conservation Area and highway safety

13. In **Limeswell**, the Inspector's decision had regard to the Streatley Conservation Area Appraisal (SCAA) of 2010. In addition to the architectural and historic merit of many of the buildings which line the High Street, the SCAA recognises the importance of green and open spaces and the views through, even glimpses, to the River Thames and to higher land and wooded hills and the wider rural setting of the village. The Inspector commented that the garden is not specifically identified in the SCAA as an important garden on open space. Similarly, SCAA did not identify the view through the appeal site as one of its key long distance views. The Inspector judged both aspects on its present

merits, finding the open garden behind the wall and the gap in the street scene do make a positive contribution to the character of the CA. However, the Inspector concluded that the subdivision of the site would conserve this character, and the proposed house would not be prominent in views from the High Street because of its set back and siting. No objections were raised in this respect.

14. However, the Inspector did raise concerns with the effect of the revised boundary wall and entranceway. He commented that the existing flint and brick wall is an imposing feature which contributes positively to the character of the CA, and provides a striking sense of enclosure to the public realm. He concluded that the combination of the proposed setting back, and the gap formed by the new entranceway, where the side walls would return at 90°, results in a substantial 'hole' in the frontage. This would be visually intrusive, and the sense of enclosure established by the present alignment and form of the wall would be lost. Consequently he found the impact on the CA unacceptable.
15. The Inspector concluded that the proposals would not harm the setting of some listed buildings, but would cause 'less than substantial' harm to the setting other those on the southern side of the High Street which would be affected by the changes to the frontage wall.
16. Finally, the Inspector agreed with the Council that the access would undermine highway safety. He recognised that much of the highway is restricted by double yellow lines, but there was an unrestricted area close to the access where a vehicle could park after the access was constructed. He expressed concerns in practical terms that such parking would greatly restrict the visibility of vehicles approaching from the west to the detriment of highway safety. The Inspector recognised that the proposed visibility splays were substandard according to Manual for Streets, and expressed concerns for the wall if improvements were sought. The Inspector recognised the local objections for loss of on-street parking caused by the formation of the new access, but stated that if the other aspects of the scheme had been acceptable, the loss of limited on-street parking facilities would not be sufficient reason on its own to reject the proposal.

Green corridor at Oxford Road, Purley on Thames

17. In **Theobald Drive**, permission was sought for seven detached dwellings on a broadly rectangular area of sloping woodland between the Oxford Road (A329) and Theobald Drive (a residential cul-de-sac). The site is subject to an Area Tree Preservation Order (TPO), and the Inspector recognised that, as part of a green corridor and an area of natural or semi-natural green space, the appeal site contributes to the green infrastructure (GI) of the area. 25 metres of woodland would be lost to accommodate the development, with the retention of two woodland 'buffers' which wrap around either end. The retained woodland (around 54% of the site) was proposed to be enhanced by additional planting and management. No additional GI was proposed.
18. Notwithstanding the low quality of many individual trees, the lack of public access and the absence of protected species, the Inspector concluded the loss of a significant area for the development would significantly diminish the site's contribution to the amenity of the area and green infrastructure. She also considered the replacement tree planting would be overbearing on occupants of the dwelling, and render large parts of their gardens unusable. She had limited confidence in the long term effectiveness of the proposed woodland management.
19. The Inspector commented that the section of Oxford Road between the Roebuck Public House and the Knowsley Road roundabout is characterised by areas of woodland and

tree lined planting of varying depths. The south side has long sections with no footpath and the woodland directly abutting the carriageway. The north side has a footpath but is characterised by trees and understorey planting set behind low walls and close-board fencing. Consequently the predominant character along Oxford Road, particularly its southern side, is both verdant and sylvan. Similarly Theobald Drive has “an attractive, verdant and tranquil character.” The Inspector recognised that the character has changed as a result of recent developments, particularly Rawlins Rise, and commented that, with the benefit of viewing the development some four years on, this section has not largely maintained its attractive tree lined appearance as envisaged by the Inspector for that appeal. This evidently factored into her concern for the character and appearance of the area.

Permitted development rights for solar panels

20. Article 3 and Schedule 2, Part 14, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (GPDO) grants a national planning permission for the installation, alteration or replacement of microgeneration solar PV or solar thermal equipment on a dwellinghouse. This ‘permitted development right’ is subject to limitations and conditions set out in paragraphs A.1 and A.2 of Part 14. The Council refused to grant a LDC in **4 The Maltings** on the basis that it would breach conditions A.2(a) and (b), which require solar PV is, so far as practicable, sited so as to minimise its effect on the external appearance of the building and the amenity of the area. The phrase ‘so far as practicable’ is not defined in the GPDO.
21. The Inspector confirmed that these conditions do not require a conventional assessment of the effect of the proposal on the external appearance of the dwelling and the amenity of the area. Nevertheless, it must be shown, that in practical terms, the effects have been minimised. The Inspector recognised that the roof form of the dwelling (within the AONB and Conservation Area) contributes significantly to its overall architectural composition. The application supporting documentation includes a quotation that puts forward two solutions that the company say will provide a ‘strong platform to manage and control reliance on the National Grid for future household energy needs’. The Inspector commented that to pursue an option beyond the recommended 15 panels runs counter to minimising their effect because, in general terms, a lesser number of panels is more likely to be able to be sited in a way which minimises their effect. Moreover, proposed layout would have a significantly greater roof coverage than that stated in the quotation. All of these locations would be visible from various points of The Maltings.
22. Accordingly, the Inspector concluded that the appellant had not demonstrated that the solar panels on the front roof pitch of the dwelling would, so far as practicable, be sited so as to minimise their effect on the external appearance of the building and the amenity of the area, in breach of limitations A.2(a) and A.2(b). This appeal decision provides a useful reference for how to assess compliance with these limitations in future cases.

EAPC decision: Maple Corner, Maple Lane, Upper Basildon

23. Permission was sought for a new two storey detached dwelling within the garden land of a bungalow. In the Housing Site Allocations DPD, Upper Basildon is regarded as a smaller village – suitable only for limited infill development. The Inspector was therefore satisfied that the site lies within the village context and that the principle of the erection of a new dwelling is acceptable subject to specific factors concerning the site and its surroundings.
24. The Inspector considered the appeal site is read in a village context rather than the open fields to the south and the wider rural landscape of the AONB. They commented that the

existing bungalow occupies a large site on a corner and there is reasonable space to the property to the south which fronts the cul-de-sac of Sykes Gardens. Taking account of the wider setting of the village in the AONB, the plot size of the proposed dwelling, together with the residual garden of Maple Corner, are still characteristic of the area. Moreover, the local properties tend to be two storeys in height. The proposal continues this design while leaving sufficient space to maintain the setting of the bungalow. In relation to other local buildings the scale, bulk and design of the dwelling proposed is appropriate to the area, as demonstrated in the street scene elevation, and the design of the new house would sit comfortably in the street scene. The Inspector concluded that the development would not look cramped in the immediate setting of the site, nor result in overdevelopment, which were fundamental concerns of the Council's Planning Committee.

25. In terms of the visual impact of creating a new access, the Inspector noted that this would be outside of the canopies of the existing mature trees, but the access and sight lines would require the removal of much of a roadside hedge. However, they commented that the hedge is of common rural species and the scheme provides for the planting of a replacement hedge and trees. Thus, the visual change brought about by the loss of the hedge was considered to be relatively short term and is unlikely to result in a suburbanising effect in the long term. The Inspector commented that the adjacent development at Sykes Gardens shows that landscaping along a highway can be successfully integrated with a vision splay for an access.
26. The main issue in terms of neighbouring amenity was the relationship with the adjoining 1 Sykes Gardens, the side elevation of which faces the appeal site. The Inspector commented that, while it is proposed to site the new dwelling closer to the boundary than the distance to the side of 1 Sykes Gardens, this proximity would be greater than the relationship between the other properties in Sykes Gardens. They recognised that the limited space is unlikely to be sufficient to retain or plant new shrubs/vegetation within the appeal site, but nevertheless the relationship between the proposed and existing houses would not be a harmful one. The aspects from the north facing windows in No.1 are already very restricted by the party boundary fence and vegetation within that site. The presence of the side wall of the appeal house will not make this materially worse, notwithstanding the Building Research Establishment (BRE) 'vision line'. It is similar to the relationship already established in nearby properties and where the main aspect is front and back.
27. Overall, the Inspector concluded that the proposed dwelling would be consistent with and maintain the established character and appearance of the area and would not harm the local environment or the wider landscape character of the AONB, and that the occupants of 1 Sykes Gardens would retain a reasonable level of amenity at their property and the proposal would not harm their living conditions.

EAPC decision: Three Cliffs, Bere Court Road, Pangbourne

28. The appeal proposal would subdivide this existing plot and would replace the existing barn building with a new dwelling. The settlement boundary for Pangbourne runs through the appeal site. The existing dwelling is located wholly within the settlement boundary, however the proposed dwelling would be adjacent to, but outside of this settlement boundary. The appeal proposal would therefore be located within the open countryside.
29. The Inspector agreed that the appeal site was located outside of the settlement boundary, and thus there is conflict with the above policies which seek to steer development to existing settlements. This conflict with the development plan is

something which they afforded weight to in their consideration of the appeal proposals. However, the Inspector went on to discuss the unique circumstances of this case.

30. The Inspector had regard the strategic aims of Policies ADPP1 and ADPP5, to focus development within or adjacent to the settlements specified in the settlement hierarchy, and related to transport accessibility, especially by public transport, cycling and walking, and their level of service, and that Pangbourne is identified as a rural service centre providing a district centre shopping function with a range of services and facilities. The appeal site is located an approximate 15 minute walk from the centre of Pangbourne which provides a number of services and facilities. As such the Inspector considered it would be entirely feasible for future residents to access these facilities via sustainable modes such as walking and cycling. They noted the Council's concerns that the roads surrounding the appeal site are narrow, with no footways and are unlit; however they referred to the low vehicle speeds and numbers in the area during their site visit, and that a number of residents were seen walking the roads.
31. In terms of the character of the appeal site itself, the Inspector commented that in this instance the appeal proposal would be located directly adjacent to the settlement boundary, and would share a close spatial relationship with the neighbouring properties. It would be located within an area which clearly has a predominantly residential feel to it, and the development would assimilate well with the surrounding residential dwellings and the proposal would not appear isolated. The proposal would not harm the existing relationship of the settlement and the open countryside.
32. In terms of concerns that allowing the development within this garden would set a precedent for other similar proposals in this area, the Inspector commented that they were not aware of any examples of specific sites which could be developed in the locality. Furthermore, each appeal and application must be judged on its own merits, and they did not have any compelling evidence to indicate that should the appeal be allowed this would encourage similar development in the area.
33. The Inspector concluded that although the appeal proposal conflicts with policies ADPP1, ADPP5 and CS1 of the CS, and policy C1 of the HSADPD, in so far as the development would be located outside of the settlement boundary, it would accord with the aims of those policies which seek, amongst other things, that development is located in accessible locations. The appeal site is therefore an appropriate location for housing.

WAPC/DPC decision: Inglewood Farm Cottage

34. The appeal site in this case comprises an existing cottage style dwelling situated adjacent to Inglewood Road, Kintbury. The site is located outside of any settlement and is therefore within the open countryside. It has a large rear garden with mature trees. The Inspector considered the site had a distinctive open rural feel.
35. Planning permission was already granted for a replacement dwelling. The amended plans which were the subject of this appeal would create a new wing which would extend in a broadly southern direction by a distance of approximately 8.5 metres. It would have a ridge height slightly lower than the main roof of the house. A new parking arrangement was proposed that would necessitate the removal of two mature trees on the site frontage.
36. Policy C7 of the HSA DPD pertains to the replacement of existing dwellings within the countryside. It states, amongst other things that there is a presumption in favour of the replacement of an existing dwelling of permanent construction. Replacement dwellings will be permitted providing that the replacement dwelling is proportionate in size and

scale to the existing dwelling, uses appropriate materials and does not have an adverse impact on the character and local distinctiveness of the rural area. There was no dispute that the original proposal complied with the policy, but the appeal proposal would substantially increase the size of the replacement dwelling, and the Council raised concerns that this would result in a dwelling which is not proportionate in size and scale to the existing dwelling. The proposal would represent an increase of floor space by approximately 253% compared to the original dwelling.

37. The Inspector noted that Policy C7 does not provide a definition nor metric in which proportionality is measured. However, the explanatory text states that the key components of proportionality are scale, massing, height and layout of a development. Any size increase has to be considered on the basis of the impact of a particular property in a particular location. The Inspector stated that, clearly, the definition and degree of harm is a matter of planning judgement based on the site specifics.
38. The Inspector noted the substantial increase to the overall footprint of the development. They considered that the scale of the proposal when compared to the somewhat modest existing dwelling would result in a disproportionate size dwelling. The totality of development would, in their view, add considerable built form within this predominantly sparsely developed rural area, which would significantly harm the character and appearance of the area.
39. The Inspector had regard to the screening on some boundaries, but found that the orientation of the extension would increase its visibility from a public viewpoint, adding considerable built form into a current verdant garden space. The removal of mature vegetation to facilitate the development would also add a degree of urbanisation to the street scene. A number of environmental benefits included within the proposal were considered to represent minor benefits and not outweigh the significant harm identified.

EAPC decision: Church View Barn, Stanford Dingley

40. The Inspector commented that the proposed garage and log store would be located in a similar position to the existing stable building and has been designed so that it would remain predominantly obscured by the hedgerow and proposed landscaping along the frontage of the site. Only glimpsing views would occur via the access driveway. Views of the building from the surrounding countryside would be obscured by the mature vegetation along the southern boundary of the site and the host dwelling to the east. It would appear subservient in scale and design to the host dwelling and comprise of building materials complimentary of the host dwelling and surrounding rural character of development.
41. The Inspector recognised that the host dwelling is a replacement dwelling and is a larger built form than has historically been on the site. They also noted that an attached garage previously existed before being converted to form an integrated part of the dwelling. Nevertheless, they concluded that the open and spacious characteristics of the site and sporadic pattern of development would be preserved as part of the proposal and would not detrimentally erode the surrounding landscape characteristics of the AONB.

WAPC decisions: Summerfield

42. The main issue for the reserved matters was the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.
 - **Scale:** The Inspector commented that they would be taller and larger than the existing dwellings which adjoin the eastern and western boundaries of the site, but

that the provision of single storey garages at either end of the site would provide a transition. The proposed dwellings would be set back from the road, with gaps provided between them, allowing views of the open landscape to the south. Furthermore, he noted that the appeal site slopes away to the south, with the design approach seeking to utilise the topography to further reduce the presence of the dwellings when viewed from The Ridge. As a consequence, he concluded the proposal would not appear as an overly dominant form of development.

- **Appearance:** Each dwelling would have a slightly different design approach. There are however a number of common features such as chimneys, gables and a similarity in footprint shape. The Inspector stated this commonality is however not necessarily harmful. The appeal site is an infill plot within the existing pattern of ribbon development, therefore there is an element of design logic to creating a sense of rhythm and pattern, whilst ensuring that each plot is treated individually. Variety would be achieved through the use of different materials, timber framing and brick detailing. Considering the variety that already exists within the street scene, the Inspector considered the design of the appeal properties contains sufficient variation, along with suitable local references.

43. The main issues for the “discharge of conditions” appeal were whether the proposed materials were in keeping with the character and appearance of the area, and whether the proposal makes adequate provision for secure cycle storage.

- With respect to the materials, the Inspector commented that within the immediate vicinity of the appeal site and along The Ridge, existing dwellings display a varied style in terms of their design and form. Materials are also varied and include a range of different types and colour of brickwork, render, tile hanging and weather boarding. The design and finish of windows, doors, soffits and fascia boards are also mixed, with either wood or uPVC finish, with colours differing from plot to plot. Therefore, there is no singular particular material or finish which defines the overall character of the area, however that said, most materials appear to be of high quality. The Inspector concluded that the proposed dwellings would be completed in a range of materials and finishes, which he considered would reflect and respect the nature and appearance of surrounding developments.
- With respect to the cycle storage, it was intended that each dwelling would be served by either a garage or a car port and, within these, there would be sufficient space to securely store cycles via wall brackets. The Inspector commented that, whilst the submitted garage details do not show the provision of brackets, the details demonstrate that all properties would be provided with a dry and lockable space that would provide sufficient room for the safe and secure storage of cycles.

Other decisions

44. The following decisions have also been received and are listed in the table above, but do not raise any issues of general interest:

- 60 Reading Road – site specific considerations of highway safety and street scene